

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

JON MICHAEL WHITE,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CASE NO. 2:18-cv-971-RAH-JTA
	)	(WO)
COVINGTON COUNTY, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Jon White, proceeding *pro se*, filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action on November 16, 2018. Defendants have since filed an Answer, a Written Report with supplements, and supporting evidentiary materials denying Plaintiff's allegations. Docs. 21, 25, 30, 37. On June 26, 2019, the Court instructed Plaintiff to file a response to Defendants' materials by July 11, 2019. Doc. 26. The Court's June 26, 2019, Order informed Plaintiff his failure to file a response would result in a recommendation this case be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Doc. 26 at 2. The Court granted Plaintiff an extension to July 31, 2019, to file a response. Doc. 28; *see also* Doc. 36. To date, Plaintiff has not filed a response to Defendants' materials or otherwise complied with the Court's June 26, 2019, Order.


A federal district court has the inherent power to dismiss a case *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or obey a court order. *See, e.g., Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629–30 (1962); FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b). The Eleventh Circuit has made clear that “dismissal is warranted only upon a ‘clear record of delay or willful contempt and a finding that lesser

sanctions would not suffice.” *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-Op of Fla.*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989) (per curiam) (emphasis omitted) (quoting *Goforth v. Owens*, 766 F.2d 1533, 1535 (11th Cir. 1985)). Here, the undersigned finds Plaintiff has willfully failed to file a response in compliance with the Court’s June 26, 2019, Order. And considering Plaintiff’s disregard for orders of this Court, the undersigned further finds sanctions lesser than dismissal would not suffice in this case.

Accordingly, the undersigned Magistrate Judge RECOMMENDS this case be DISMISSED without prejudice.

It is ORDERED that the parties may file any objections to the Recommendation **by November 2, 2021**. Any objections filed by a party must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation to which objection is made. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. This Recommendation is not a final order and, therefore it is not appealable. Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations in the Magistrate Judge’s report shall bar a party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of factual findings and legal issues covered in the report and shall “waive the right to challenge on appeal the district court’s order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions” except upon grounds of plain error if necessary in the interests of justice. 11TH Cir. R. 3-1; *see Resolution Trust Co. v. Hallmark Builders, Inc.*, 996 F.2d 1144, 1149 (11th Cir. 1993); *Henley v. Johnson*, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989).

DONE this 18th day of October, 2021.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JERUSHA T. ADAMS  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE